



**MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS**  
MARYLAND  
www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org

June 1, 2015



The Honorable Roger Berliner  
Montgomery County Council  
Stella B. Werner Council Office Building  
100 Maryland Avenue  
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Dear Mr. Berliner:

Thank you for your request of May 8, 2015, to provide responses to the school system planning process questions submitted by *Infrastructure Forum* participants that were compiled following the *Infrastructure Forum* meeting held on March 7, 2015, at Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School. Staff from Montgomery County Public Schools and the Montgomery County Planning Department have collaborated on the responses (Enclosure). Given the fact that many inquiries were similar in nature, the responses are grouped by topic.

You have my thanks for your continued support of our students, staff, parents, and stakeholders. If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Andrew M. Zuckerman, acting chief operating officer, at 301-279-3627 or Mr. James Song, director, Department of Facilities Management, at 240-314-1064.

Sincerely,

Larry A. Bowers  
Interim Superintendent of Schools

LAB:AMZ:JS:BC:lm

Enclosure

Copy to:

Members of the County Council  
Members of the Board of Education  
Dr. Statham  
Dr. Navarro  
Dr. Zuckerman

Ms. Turner-Little  
Mr. Crispell  
Mr. Song  
Ms. Dunn  
Mr. Ikheloa

Office of the Superintendent of Schools

---

850 Hungerford Drive, Room 122 ♦ Rockville, Maryland 20850 ♦ 301-279-3381

**Montgomery County Public Schools and Montgomery County Planning Department**

**Infrastructure Forum Responses**

**Meeting of March 7, 2015—Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School**

June 1, 2015

The following descriptions of school system planning processes respond to questions that were submitted by Infrastructure Forum participants. Many questions pertain to distinct aspects of school system planning and responses to growth. To provide comprehensive explanations of planning processes, the following responses apply to the pertinent topics (see attachment for the comprehensive list of the questions).

**Long-range Planning**

Facility planning in Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) focuses on two timeframes.

First, the student enrollment projections and requests for capital improvements—including school additions, new schools, and school revitalization/expansions—focus on a six-year period. The six-year period is important because the county's capital improvement program is a six-year program and school plans need to align with this funding period. The capital projects that address capacity issues must be justified by six-year student enrollment projections to be eligible for funding. In many areas of the county, there are master plans that may allow for additional housing units. New housing units are included in the six-year forecast once they have received preliminary plan approval from the Montgomery County Planning Board. The county only will fund school projects that are justified by current student enrollment trends and approved plans for new housing developments.

Second, student enrollment projections extend beyond the six-year period. A tenth and fifteenth year is projected for schools. The purpose of these long-range projections is to provide an outlook and ensure that county leaders understand student enrollment projected beyond the six-year capital budgeting period. This helps to assure funding authorities that capital projects requested will continue to be needed beyond six years. An even longer timeframe is considered in the context of master-planned development. Master plans and sector plans can take decades to build out and MCPS must prepare for the additional student enrollment that will be generated as development occurs. To prepare for the additional student enrollment, MCPS works closely with county and city planners to designate necessary school sites in master and sector plans. As development proceeds in master-planned areas, new schools are built on the designated sites based on the timing of needs and funding availability.

MCPS has accommodated approximately 62,000 additional students since 1984 by focusing facility planning activities on the 2 timeframes described above. The planning processes that characterize each timeframe will continue to enable MCPS to accommodate additional students in the future. As the county urbanizes, additional strategies will be explored and implemented where applicable. For example, two studies are now under way in the county that will help MCPS prepare for the future. The first is a study of opportunities to collocate public schools

with complementary public facilities. As the county continues to grow and land becomes scarce, there is a need to make more efficient use of sites. Collocation of compatible programs will provide ways to maximize site utilizations. A complementary study currently under way will review school design options that minimize the acreage needed for school sites. This study will explore the experience of other school districts that have accommodated schools in urban environments. The study also will evaluate the repurposing of vacant commercial properties for schools.

### **Options for Accommodating Student Enrollment Increases at Schools**

Student enrollment pressures in MCPS require several strategies to be deployed in order to accommodate growth. For a school that is overutilized, the first strategy considered is an evaluation of available space in an adjacent school that could accommodate students from the overutilized school. If this is the case, a boundary study would be conducted and appropriate changes made. The benefit of first exploring this strategy is that it typically requires no capital funds be expended. Unfortunately, if the student enrollment increases are widespread in the county, there are very few opportunities to apply this strategy.

The next strategy applied is to determine if the school that is overutilized can be expanded. This strategy is frequently used and additions are built that bring student enrollment within the increased capacity of the school. In many parts of the county, school capacities are smaller than today's standard for construction of new schools. Therefore, in many cases, MCPS has been able to maximize use of our existing schools by expanding smaller schools to a 740-seat capacity for elementary schools, a 1,200-seat capacity for middle schools, and a 2,400-seat capacity for high schools. If an overutilized school already is at these capacity levels, then expansion of a nearby school to these capacities would be considered and boundary changes to the expanded school would be undertaken when the addition is completed.

If the strategies outlined above cannot resolve overutilization at a school, then the opening of a new school may be considered. In order to justify opening a new school, there needs to be sufficient student enrollment—beyond the capacities of existing schools in the area—to operate a new school and provide a full instructional program. Opening a new school can occur in one of two ways.

- Reopen a former school—if one is available in the area
- Conduct a site selection process for a new school and build it on the selected site

Due to limited state and local revenues, strategies to address space deficits in schools lag behind the need. Consequently, relocatable classrooms are deployed to accommodate the over- utilization of schools until a permanent solution is found.

Information on specific school plans can be accessed at the following link to the *Recommended Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 Capital Budget and Amendments to the FY 2015–2020 Capital Improvements Program*:

[www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/departments/planning/cipmaster.aspx](http://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/departments/planning/cipmaster.aspx)

## **Student Enrollment Forecasting**

Student enrollment projections for schools are prepared in the fall of each year. A forecast for six years is developed, as well as a forecast for a tenth and fifteenth year. The six-year forecast is used to determine where school capacity projects are needed and to program them in the six-year Capital Improvements Program (CIP). A mid-year revision to the one-year forecast is annually prepared in February. The revised forecast accounts for the changes in student enrollment that have occurred during the school year and is used to staff schools and determine where relocatable classrooms will be needed for the following school year.

Forecast accuracy always is a concern; MCPS staff is diligent in bringing all relevant information to bear on forecasts. MCPS considers resident birth trends, information on the economy and housing market, and the impact of students already in schools articulating to higher grade levels. MCPS also monitors forecast accuracy at each school and where errors have occurred, carefully reevaluating previous forecast assumptions. In addition, school principals are surveyed each summer to provide their perspectives on the student enrollment trends and any changes in the communities they serve.

In many areas of the county, new housing development is an important factor in forecasting. MCPS works closely with the Montgomery County Planning Department and the cities of Gaithersburg and Rockville to track housing plans as the plans move to approval. Once new housing plans are approved, MCPS regularly contacts developers to obtain building schedules.

Estimates of the impact of new housing are determined using "student yield factors." Student yield factors are the number of students that can be expected, based on recent experience, to reside in new single-family detached homes, new townhomes, new mid-rise multi-family units, and new high-rise units. Periodically, MCPS works with the Montgomery County Planning Department to match student records by address with the county parcel file. This collaboration enables MCPS to know how many students, by grade level, reside in the four types of housing units. The age of the housing unit also is available, so that estimates of the impact of comparable new housing units on student yields can be made. These yield factors are developed for the county as a whole and for three subareas of the county. In addition, MCPS frequently samples recently occupied housing units. This is made possible by matching the address of the new housing with student registration data. These samples provide the most up-to-date yield factors for specific areas of the county. All of this information is factored into student enrollment forecasts for schools serving new housing developments.

As the county urbanizes, more multi-family housing is being built. A concern of school communities in urbanizing areas is the impact of the new housing on student enrollment. This is understandable as thousands of mid- and high-rise multi-family housing units are included in master plans and sector plans. Recent sampling of newly occupied projects demonstrates that student yield rates are relatively low for the new high-density housing. For example, in a recent sampling of 3,500 high-rise housing units in the Bethesda Central Business District, 92 elementary school students, 40 middle school students, and 69 high school students resided in these units. These figures equate to a per-unit student yield rate of .026 for elementary school students, .011 for middle school students, and .020 for high school students. In contrast, student yield rates for single-family detached homes in the Bethesda are .323 for elementary school students per home, .132 for middle school students, and .153 for high school students. Over

time, student yield rates may change, and MCPS continually monitors the impact of new housing as additional buildings are occupied.

The limited impact of new mid- and high-rise multifamily housing dispels a common presumption that this housing is the source of the large student enrollment increases. MCPS has found that turnover of existing homes plays the major role in student enrollment increases. Homes that are turning over to young families are most often single-family detached homes or townhomes that yield the greatest number of students. Additional factors that have increased student enrollment in recent years are increased resident births and the movement from private to public schools.

All school enrollment forecasts are completely reevaluated every fall, based on the forecast's accuracy for that year. Any new trends that have developed in a school's enrollment are factored into the annual recalculation of the forecast. This practice allows student enrollment forecasts to evolve and adapt to changing conditions.

Student enrollment forecasts are most accurate when a trend that has been evident in recent years continues into the future. Unfortunately, unforeseen events can cause significant disruption in student enrollment trends. The approval of new subdivisions requires changes to a school's forecast. The impact of private school students enrolling in public schools and related changes in enrollment brought by the Great Recession required raising the forecast of student enrollment. The strength of the local housing market, driven by employment trends, is yet another changing factor.

Considering all the variables that affect student enrollment, MCPS enrollment forecasts have been highly accurate in most years. In the 2014–2015 school year, total MCPS enrollment was only 301 students below the forecast, with 153,852 students enrolled instead of the forecasted 154,153 students. In the 2013–2014 school year, total MCPS enrollment was only six students more than the projection. At the individual school level, MCPS has a target of projecting each school's enrollment within plus or minus 5 percent of actual enrollment. This year, 86 percent of schools fall within the desired range for accuracy.

### **School Sites and Closed Schools**

The presence of school sites in areas of growth has been important to accommodating increased enrollment. In the past 30 years, enrollment has increased by approximately 62,000 students, and MCPS has opened 57 schools—34 elementary schools, 17 middle schools, and 6 high schools. The reopening of several closed schools is included in these numbers—six elementary schools, six middle schools, and one high school. The option of opening new schools—and reopening closed schools—will continue to be important as student enrollment increases.

Most school sites are acquired through dedication of land after a need for a site is identified in a master plan. MCPS planners work closely with county and city planners during the development of master plans. The number of students that will be generated by new housing is estimated and sites then are identified on master plan maps and in the text of these plans. Most of the schools now in operation were built on sites identified in master plans.

MCPS currently has an inventory of 15 future school sites under Board of Education ownership, and an additional 11 school sites that are designated in master plans to be transferred to the

ownership of the Board of Education when needed. The timeline for using these sites for new schools is dependent upon student enrollment trends and the utilization of schools that currently serve the areas where these sites are located.

Several former MCPS schools are now used as holding centers for schools undergoing revitalization/expansion projects. "Holding centers" are former operating schools that students are relocated to during their schools' construction project. MCPS has five elementary school holding centers and one middle school holding center. These facilities are not considered for reopening as operating schools because of their importance to the revitalization/expansion program. In addition, there are a large number of other former MCPS schools that can be reclaimed if they are needed for an operating school. There are 13 former schools under Board of Education ownership and 30 former schools owned by Montgomery County that can be reclaimed for school use. All of these facilities currently are leased for a variety of purposes. Because of projected student enrollment growth, the school system and county are not disposing of any of these sites and former schools.

Former MCPS schools are primarily found in the midcounty and downcounty areas where communities are much older than in the upcounty area. In general, MCPS has few future school sites in the lower half of the county and relies more on reopening closed schools. In contrast, in the upcounty area, MCPS has very few closed schools and relies more on future school sites to open new schools. In a few instances, no future site or closed school has been available, and the county has had to purchase land for a school. Interest was recently expressed in the county purchasing the former WMAL property that went up for sale. However, there is no future school needing a site in this area, and there are other site options at no cost in the area. Given this reasoning and the anticipated high cost, the WMAL property was not pursued for purchase by the county.

Once the need for a new school is identified in the CIP, a site selection process is conducted with a range of stakeholders prior to Board of Education action to adopt a site. If there are future school sites and/or former operating schools in an area needing a new school, these locations provide important options. School sites are evaluated against many criteria, including location relative to existing schools in the area, proximity to areas with growth, transportation impacts, and walking access.

### **Subdivision Staging Policy (Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance)**

Responses to questions concerning the Subdivision Staging Policy are being developed by the Montgomery County Planning Department and will be provided when they become available.

### **Developer Payments**

#### *School Impact Tax*

All developers of new housing in the county are required to pay a "school impact tax" to help pay for their impact on school capacity. The impact tax is calculated according to the number and type of housing units being built. By applying student yield rates, the number of students generated at the elementary, middle, and high school levels by a proposed subdivision can be calculated. The developer then pays 90 percent of the per student cost of construction of elementary, middle, and high schools for the impact of their subdivision.

### *School Facility Payment*

In addition to the school impact tax that is paid by developers in all areas of the county, there also is a school facility payment. The school facility payment is part of the county Subdivision Staging Policy. If a developer is seeking to obtain plan approval in a school cluster that has schools operating above 105 percent of capacity, then the developer must commit to making a special payment that covers 60 percent of the per student cost for constructing a school. The charge will vary depending on whether the cluster elementary schools, middle schools, or high school are more than the 105 percent utilization threshold. In some cases, more than one school level will exceed the 105 percent threshold, and the developer will have to make payments for each school level that surpasses that threshold.

More than half of the MCPS school clusters have schools exceeding the 105 percent utilization threshold. Therefore, in these areas, developers make payments of 150 percent of the per student cost of constructing a new school for each student their development is estimated to generate. This figure combines the school impact tax and the school facility payment costs. These payments may be in addition to land that was required to be dedicated by large property owners for future school sites.

The current charges for the school facility payment and school impact tax can be found at the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services website at the following link:

*<http://permittingservices.montgomerycountymd.gov/DPS/pdf/ImpactTaxesHandout10.1.14.pdf>*

### **Recordation Tax**

In addition to the charges on new developments, the recordation tax enables funds for school construction to be collected as housing turns over. This is an important revenue source. Student enrollment increases in most parts of the county are attributed far more to turnover of the existing homes than to construction of new homes. This is especially true as more in-fill, high-density housing characterizes new development.



what you had to say:

## QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY FORUM REGISTRANTS

### Schools:

- ✓ 1. I do not understand why the schools consider "long-range" planning as planning five or six years out, while the sector plans are supposed to plan for 20 years out. Why doesn't the school system make semi-concrete plans for what could happen six years out, while having contingency plans that will reflect what the sector plan envisions. I understand that what is envisioned in the sector plan may not materialize, but if it does, the school system should not be scrambling for solutions.
2. There are sector and master plans where no one developer generates enough kids for a school, but collectively all of them do. (Example: first White Flint sector plan). So, most of the developers contribute no land. Why shouldn't developers pay for/contribute land proportionally for a school site?
3. The schools in the Bethesda Chevy Chase area are already over-crowded. The County wants to increase the number of housing units in the area substantially in the new Master Plan. What plans do you have to accommodate additional students?
- ✓ 4. What proactive steps can be taken to anticipate and plan for additional students resulting from development who will need to attend already-overcrowded public schools, before they add to the overcrowding problem? How can fees developers pay to the county be more equitably shared by those same crowded public school, to help plan for students' arrival?
5. The county continues to approve residential development in the down county, including a number of multifamily buildings. How can we add multifamily development without first providing space in the already overcrowded schools? When developers are spending many millions of dollars to construct new high rises, why are they not required to provide funding for additional school space to the schools serving the new development as a prerequisite to obtaining a building permit?
- ✓ 6. How will the increased school-age population be addressed by already overcrowded schools in this area? What plan is there for new and/or additional schools?
7. Why has it been assumed that there won't be a lot of kids in apartments? Why can't developers be required to contribute more money to schools to deal with over-crowding?
8. What percentage of the actual cost of "a seat in the classroom" is covered by the fees developers pay to the County?
9. Why are you MC still developing if the schools are already overcrowded? There is no money from the state to fund either new school construction or renovations of schools?
- ✓ 10. The main question should be addressed by the event. That is, how are the schools going to handle population growth? It's frustrating that when questions were raised about the inadequacy of the size of Ashburton expansion, we were told that the demographer was predicting a leveling off and decrease. We knew then and now that this is false.
11. Is there any way to limit development on open space within Potomac? This is one way to control overcrowding in the schools, some of which are overcrowded.
12. How does the Board of Education explain that they will only build elementary schools to approx 750 capacity because they do not approve of a larger elementary school, but turn a blind eye to the many elementary schools whose enrollment is well over that number and continue to grow? Ashburton currently has 915 students with an official capacity of 640. When is enough enough? In an area such as Ashburton, how is a building moratorium not in effect?
13. Why doesn't the county take back some of the old school land they still own and build new schools there rather than have these huge schools. For example, rather than add on to Ashburton again they could build a new school on the Grosvenor elementary site.



14. Can the Montgomery County demographer do a more realistic job of predicting population growth so that my kids can't end up in trailers, and can developers bear the cost of the negative externalities they create, such as advanced school construction to prevent overcrowding.

✓ 15. 1) How can we learn from the use cases presented by other large school systems in the United States on how to plan our growth to keep pace in advance and provide the total cost of ownership for schools (primarily) but also for transportation and services (water, fire, police). Surely some other rapid-growth metro areas can offer us some good examples and best practices on how we can do this better. 2) What publicly available data (now) can help? 3) How can we be more creative about funding?

✓ 16. How much are new schools and school expansion being planned in conjunction with smart growth to avoid overcrowded schools around transit as the areas grow? Also, how accurate are projections of growing school populations (with fewer babies nationally might they start to level off).

17. At what point in the development process does MCPS include new student projections in its school population projections in the affected cluster?

18. I would like a retrospective on Bruce Crispell's forecasting compared to actual school enrollment, by cluster, over the last 10 years at least.

19. Has there been or will there be consideration of changing the provisions of Montgomery County's APFO to implement stricter criteria? For example, have you thought about eliminating the practice of cluster averaging or reducing the school capacity to less than 120%? An ideal capacity standard should be 100%.

20. Will the County seriously consider amending the APFO to tighten school capacity standards? Your view on the issue as it relates to recent proposal in Rockville, and its defeat, to move to County standards.

21. Do we believe that the adequate public facilities laws ensure that our schools have sufficient capacity before we allow further development?

22. Governor Hogan has announced cuts to the GCEI which will underfund MCPS, how does MCPS plan to accommodate this budget cut? What can students expect?

23. Why doesn't MCPS consider constructing alternative grade schools (eg 5-6 grade center) on old MCPS sites like Radnor and Brookmont - as a means to alleviate enrollment burdens at the ES and MS level? School districts across the country are successfully building these types of transitional MS facilities.

24. Why not return Brookmont School to MCPS to house grades K thru 3 and have Woodacres house 4-5?

25. Can Brookmont Sch go to MCPS for K-2 & have Woodacres for 3-5, to account for higher density w/in Westbard w/ 50' height limit?

26. School crowding, boundary changes (the former Brookmont School was promised Whitman articulation)-- no time limit to this was EVER mentioned.

27. How do you expect Pyle Middle School to handle the expected population increase from Westbard when it is already overcrowded and MCPS cannot even find the money to build the badly needed gym - despite recognizing that the teachers cannot currently teach the required curriculum in the space?

28. With all the growth in enrollment at elementary schools feeding into WJ; what is the projected enrollment size at WJ in 3, 5, 10 years from now. It seems that it will be a 4000 student school. How will that be managed? When would plans for a new Bethesda-area H.S. be considered?

29. Are there any plans within the next five years to build a new elementary school to serve the growing number of residences being built in the Wyngate elementary school area?

30. How can we consider adding housing (specifically Westbard development) within the BCC Cluster when we are at maximum capacity at B-CC high school with no physical space left for additions (after the planned addition is completed)? Can MCPS take back the Washington Waldorf School on Sangamore to add another elementary school to the area?

31. A large number of apartment buildings have been built in downtown Silver Spring. I would like to know how many new units of what kind have been added to the housing stock during this housing boom, and how many students this has produced for MCPSs (by grade).

32. What consideration is being given to enhanced affordable living units in any residential development that goes beyond the 12.5% Moderate Priced Dwelling Units (MPDUs) required by county statute for developments of 20 or more units.

33. I do not understand how MoCo Council has made a policy decision to officially allow 120% over capacity to public schools before halting new housing development. One may be faced with reality that demographic changes may occur causing unexpected increase in number of students that may cause over capacity. However, to officially sanction 120% overcapacity is stupid, and as elected officials, is negligent.

34. How will downtown Bethesda's population growth and development (with 5000 condos in development) be managed at Bethesda schools?

35. Will Elementary School #5 in Richard Montgomery Cluster stay on track? Will Julius West Middle School expansion stay on track?

36. What processes are there by which county or BOE land/buildings are reclaimed to be used as a school site? How are former school properties disposed of if not needed? Is a fair market value determined to be sold?

37. Has the MCPS staff begun to re-evaluate the criteria for schools sites to allow for the building of schools with a smaller footprint in the down county area? If not, why not?

38. Thinking more urban regarding school sites?

✓ 39. Why does the County not plan for future development when building school capacity?

✓ 40. What efforts are MCPS taking to anticipate growth from developments like Westbard when they make their CIP plans? Why do they wait until kids are getting on the school bus to count them when they know they are coming as part of these developments? And, if the schools are at or already exceeding capacity, why are we allowing development without a concurrent plan to expand our schools to handle increased capacity as a result of development. We can't put kids in spaces we don't have.

41. Cluster-averaging and 5-year CIP projections have allowed the County to overcrowd its schools well-beyond 120-percent of their program capacity. They have tortured the County's APFO into allowing schools even above 180-percent of capacity. That's nearly 200-percent of program capacity. Will the County finally abandon cluster-averaging and 5-year projections for more realistic standards, or will students, teachers, parents, and communities be forever tied to these indefensible standards?

42. Does cluster averaging pose a conflict with the Equal Protection clause of the Constitution? A group of apparently more privileged students is tolerated at under-average schools. Further, this mechanism effectively perpetuates that uneven delivery of government services.

43. Not so much a question as a comment. Turning large schools into schools within schools is not the answer. It does not address issues like still having only one football or basketball team and only one cheerleading squad. As the size of schools increase, the chances of getting on a team decrease, not only raising tension among students, but also negatively impacting college applications with respect to afterschool activities, etc.

✓ 44. Over development is outpacing our school's ability to keep up.

✓ 45. Given budget realities, hard choices will need to be made about how the county spends its money. If Montgomery County schools are perceived as declining in quality, that will likely deter many people with school-age children from moving here, even more so than traffic issues. How can school quality be maintained in the absence of adequate school planning for the growth you're willing to allow?

46. Why are new school locations closer to current student growth not considered during RevEx projects that involve building a new school? Why are transportation costs and impacts not considered in the location choice for new schools, additions, and RevEx? Why are investments in new school facilities not targeted toward where we want redevelopment that can leverage existing infrastructure rather than toward where growth is easiest such as Clarksburg?

47. Why are schools not required to have active transportation policies and plans to address safety issues that prevent walking and biking?

48. Why are there not bicycle racks available at every school?

49. Why does the County not support locations of schools that would foster community-centered schools in the downtowns of mixed used developments?

50. How can the County work better with the municipal jurisdictions and planning commissions, such as the City of Rockville to make sure that school facility fees for development within the City are collected by the County and used for the schools in Rockville?

51. Disconnects between county agencies have delayed the new elementary school in the RM cluster - First, both MCPS and DGS planned to build there, but neither knew the other's plans. Second, the inability to relocate the CRC was behind a 2 year delay and that delay caused the project to get caught in another delay. Now, five years after the proposal was put forward, we are still looking for a site for CRC. How can County government work with MCPS to ensure the timely return of former school sites? How can we get playing field space for our schools?

52. I am very concerned at the disconnect between Planners and MCPS. With all the excessive redevelopment going on in 3 sector plans in BCC cluster, and all the present school overcrowding, how will this be addressed?

53. Why do certain county planning processes (e.g. master plans) not seem to line up with how MCPS plans for growth?

54. Would love to hear an update on boundary decisions regarding the new middle school in Kensington at this forum. Thanks!

55. We hear a lot about job preparation, but not much about critical thinking. What are the schools doing to prepare students to function as responsible citizens?

56. If the County needs development in order to maintain its tax base for public services, why don't the development taxes (school impact taxes, school facility payments, etc.) fully pay for at least the corresponding one-time costs of building new schools (with land), additions, and revitalization/expansions?

57. What is the plan for extending school bus service to private school students?

58. I live in the Stratton Woods neighborhood, near the current WMAL site that is now for sale. If this land is developed, what adjustments will be made for school assignments? I believe this site is technically in Ashburton/NB/WJ cluster but I'm afraid that Ashburton, in particular cannot absorb any more students. Related to this question, is there ANY talk of doing a boundary study down county. It seems that with so much growth, this needs to be done.

59. Will MCPS and the Council and the Planning Department work together to find a way to buy land on the WMAL site for a school?

60. In the downcounty, we need more space for more schools. For example, the Westbard tract should include a school and the WMAL tract should include a high school, as well as development (housing, offices, retail).

**Transportation:**

1. I would like to know about the future plans on providing better public transportation connection between Bethesda, Whiteflint, Rockville beside existing metro and bus connection.

2. What effect do you expect the Purple Line to have on the future of Downtown Bethesda?

3. How does walkability of the streets figure in the planning for the future of Downtown Bethesda?

4. My husband submit three questions. In his second question he omitted a point that will help clarify the question. He intended to state that the Purple line construction from the East to Silver springs would go forward as planned, and the decision to delay construction to Bethesda from Silver Spring would be delayed before finalizing the decision whether it is the best approach. He would like this statement o be included in his question and support the change.
5. What is the current plan to move walkers, bikers, and others along the trail from East of Wisconsin Ave. to entrance on Bethesda Ave that is West of Wisconsin Ave. This issue needs more discussion. What would be the pros and cons of delaying the construction of the Purple Line to Bethesda, getting the new Subway and Bus station fixed up before finalizing the decision to build the Purple Line to Bethesda?
6. Development in Bethesda is based on proximity to the Metro. The same is true of White Flint. Development along the possible Purple Line also would feed new riders onto this system. What is the County doing to improve maintenance/ infrastructure/service in anticipation of so many new riders on the Metro?
7. Can the Sector Plan require an additional road between River and Mass, because additional traffic, the requirements for police/fire/ambulance, business and residents will need the support?
8. The streets are overcrowded? The metro is overcrowded and our tax dollars are already paying for water and sewer improvements on infrastructure due to aged pipes? Lack of transportation like Metro and the Rockville pike plan improving the Rockville pike?
9. If we're supposed to live where we work, to live in Bethesda one needs a very high level job. But many of those lucrative jobs, especially in burgeoning IT or technology fields, by their very nature can be done remotely. Also, many of those jobs are consultancies that involve random travel around the region. Additionally, as new satellite job hubs and activities centers evolve, travel patterns will change. Are you sure the County is proposing transportation choices apt for what lies in store?
10. The close-in suburban neighborhood of Wyngate Elementary School, as well as adjoining neighborhoods, have road surfaces that are crumbling. Why can't all these streets be repaved so that our infrastructure is top notch? You feel these road problems in a car, but even much more when riding a bike. People would use bikes in lieu of cars more often if the road surfaces were better. After repaving, mark bike lanes and add signage. Patching potholes is not enough.
11. How will the CCT be funded so it can be built more quickly?
12. Does the county have intention to expand the metro transport system stops beyond shady grove station to the upper county? If so, what is the time frame and the estimated cost for the project?
13. How will BRT be funded? What ideas are being considered? Maybe the Independent Transportation Authority concept could be modified to be acceptable?
14. What is a reasonable time frame for a 355South BRT prototype?
15. Would road pricing (tolls) of selected major County roads be considered as a means to fund needed transit and bicycle infrastructure, as well as to fund maintenance of roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, and transit facilities, including the BRT?
16. Changing the testing for transportation in urban areas and at transit stations?
17. Winter=big mobility issues for pupils and adults. All trips begin & end by foot or personal mobile conveyance. Cute County reminders on shoveling do help, but can we get better direction/follow through for 1) County plows to NOT dump the plowload of snow directly in front of sidewalk and path curb cuts at intersections, 2) community service policy and web lists by zip-plus of students willing to help shovel, 3) PSA/messages to encourage clearing stubborn patches as conditions improve? Thanks
18. The traffic on Connecticut Ave. and Wisconsin Ave. near NIH and Walter Reed is untenable. Why can't (a) a few express buses started with very limited stops down Connecticut and Wisconsin that let out at NIH and then go downtown to Faragut North. This would reduce traffic on Connecticut/Wisconsin. (b) The Grosvenor metro garage is ridiculous! Take out the reserved spaces, which are never used and you get a \$64 ticket if you need to park after the garage fills. They also never deice the garage.

19. Sumner now has illegal parking by 40 ICC-B construction workers. How can we avoid worse traffic when ICC-B will have 440 fewer parking spaces than original plan?

20. I am glad that METRO decided against the fare increase and reduction of service. Needs to have better oversight of METRO. Many people count on METRO for commuting to work or going to the MALL.

21. Is there any way to put a traffic light on River Road in front of the elementary school? I have seen many near accidents at this location. Also the corner of Gary Road / Normandie Farm Drive (near PES)?

22. Parking/ better non-car transportation- bus, light rail, etc.

23. Crowding on the roads to/from the center

**General Growth:**

1. There is a complete disconnect between planners and the public.

2. With the population expected to increase at least 20% by 2040, we'll want to conserve finances while using infrastructure more intensively. Please comment on these 2 ideas:

Roads -- buses (carrying upwards of 60 people) use the roadway more intensively than 60 single-occupancy vehicles. Schools include gyms, fitness centers, libraries, playing fields -- can we co-locate these facilities such that the community can use them as well? Thereby building less infrastructure.

3. How--exactly--do county leaders plan for school and transportation needs when they approve new housing developments in the county and to what extent are developers expected to help pay for the costs of new school and transportation needs that result from their developments?

4. To quote an ad for a new apartment building in Bethesda: two bedrooms, the second for "a guest room, office, or a nursery." More kids. My 6th and 4th grader's schools in Chevy Chase have run out of room -- music is held in the teacher's lounge, next to a fridge. A massive disconnect has arisen between our building capacity and our schools and roads. Families move in. Families travel in cars. Sports, activities, and friends require it. How can we stop wishing and instead plan for reality?

5. What will the county do to have a more compatible APFO with the City of Rockville? Will Rockville be penalized for having a straighter APFO code?

6. Proposed WSSC fees were developed without consulting any of top 10 customers. This could have unintended consequences for economic development. If proposed fees are adopted, will they be rolled back if they harm economic development?

7. What can the county do to improve the quality of resources for all of the new residents moving to Bethesda? DC has improved the quality of public sports venues. Let's compare the Bethesda pool to the Wilson pool. What a difference!!!

8. For Upcounty communities, especially Clarksburg, while transit is a stated solution (though with minimal ROI given the reality), what auto-related measures would County take to pro-actively address the severe lack in infrastructure that has not kept pace with growth? Why is County politics associated with the master plan alignment of M-83 holding Upcounty communities hostage?

9. Please supply Census-based population of Montgomery County (latest results & demographic analyses in-depth including school-age children, by acknowledged experts) and published sources for projected future population 'growth' in Montgomery County, with names and qualifications of all demographers/associated experts who performed referenced studies. We need transparent data-base for Population Dynamics of future populations - including stability, areas of anticipated growth (or decline).

10. Why should existing property owners pay with taxes and fees for transit and education infrastructure improvements made necessary by population increases brought about by development projects by profit seeking enterprises? Shouldn't such costs be made a part of the developers' cost of doing business? Shouldn't the tax and fee exposure of existing property owners be limited to necessary upgrades and updates to such infrastructure as actually used by such property owners, e.g., water, electric, etc

11. Why can't we limit the height of all buildings in the Westbard Plan to 50 feet, when the Developer said that they could make money even at 45 feet?
12. Explain the process of how commercial and residential developers/builders request permission for new development projects, how these requests are managed, how and why they are approved or disapproved and; how and when in the process affected residents and the public are notified and engaged in the decision making?
13. Why must the county continue to grow, especially in downcounty areas that are already crowded?
14. Re Westbard Plan, MoCo Planning Dept wants ALL proposed infrastructure & amenities in new Plan. How to work with Dept that has no interest in 50' building height limit, as 50'-80' heights needed to achieve Dept goals?
15. What is the county doing to address increased polarization by income, race and ethnicity between various areas of Montgomery County? Schools are impacted when high poverty students are concentrated in specific areas (refer to Performance of MCPS's HS OLO report 4/2014).
16. Moving the public library (Westbard Plan)???
17. What is the county doing to attract upper middle class families to the eastern side of the county? There seems to be a huge amount of stores/restaurants in Bethesda/Rockville but little in other areas like Colesville.
18. I miss the old Bethesda Cinema Draft House (or Bethesda Theatre Cafe). What can be done to have a movie theatre exactly like that again?
19. I am against more toll roads or Lexus Lanes.
20. I am against the destruction of White Flint Mall. This has caused Montgomery Mall to be REALLY REALLY overcrowded.
21. Caroline-Freeland Park redesign -- Update on its buffer role and use objectives.
22. "Schools and transportation" seems to be a sub-set of larger questions about how we want to evolve and grow:
  - a) Perhaps like most post-WWII suburbs, driving for almost everything we do, or
  - b) Like vintage/retro cities and neighborhoods with kids walking or taking the Ride-On/Metrobus to school, and shopping / entertainment / work nearby, or
  - c) Maybe something new? (Although I'm skeptical that there is anything entirely new!)